A U M

Search thou the path of the soul, whence she came, or what way, after serving the body, by joining work with sacred speed, thou shalt raise her again to the same state whence she fell.
—ZOROASTER.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX June, 1942 No. 8

HOLDER OF THE FAITH

MANY are those who hold the faith with their ambition, with their family, with their God. Robert Crosbie's faith was of another order. He held faith with the unknown, the unseen, the discredited by other men. He held faith with the Teachers, during their life, after their passing, and for all time. That the Teachers' light went out in other men but lighted him with clearer flame. That the years grew darker for the world's fate but made the fire of his being ignite with swifter touch the fuel placed upon the altar of Theosophy by searching hearts and groping minds.

Can those who breathe the faith of Robert Crosbie's life and faith do less now than hold the faith? Faith in Theosophy—that is simple. Faith in Masters—that goes without saying. Faith in the Good Law? Or, is this an abstraction? Who will hold faith in his fellow Theosophists, that they too may feel themselves engirded by the strong Will of the Movement? That they may keep the world in balance by their universal charity, their ungrudging love? Who will hold faith with the Race?

Who will hold the faith with Robert Crosbie—with his will and work and wisdom—following his injunction, that work for the race *must be done by men and women of the race,* and in the lines laid down by Them—lines laid to safeguard the future, now our present? Such men and women will serve to dissipate dark influences; they will awaken others to the realities of our common human life that lie far deeper than the turmoil and the chaos. Assisting others' right thoughts by right thinking, living in charity and patience and good will to all men, they will hold the faith with all Teachers of the past and of the future, ameliorating the conditions of this cycle of Kali Yug, and making a channel of hope and help and knowledge leading down the years to the new and greater impartation.

UNIVERSAL APPLICATIONS OF DOCTRINE

[A peculiar value of the articles of William Q. Judge is the way he develops the implications of the Fundamentals of the Theosophical philosophy as recorded by H. P. B. As much as "writing on Theosophy," he was providing illustrations to students of the method of study that should be followed—along "the lines laid down." The present article, "Universal Applications of Doctrine," first appeared in the *Path* for October, 1889.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

DURING the last few years in which so much writing has been done in the theosophical field of effort, a failure to make broad or universal applications of the doctrines brought forward can be noticed. With the exception of H. P. Blavatsky, our writers have confined themselves to narrow views, chiefly as to the state of man after death or how Karma affects him in life. As to the latter law, the greatest consideration has been devoted to deciding how it modifies our pleasure or our pain, and then as to whether in Devachan there will be compensation for failures of Karma; while others write upon reincarnation as if only mankind were subject to that law. And the same limited treatment is adopted in treating of or practising many other theories and doctrines of the Wisdom Religion. After fourteen years of activity it is now time that the members of our society should make universal the application of each and every admitted doctrine or precept, and not confine them to their own selfish selves.

In order to make my meaning clear I propose in this paper to attempt an outline of how such universal applications of some of our doctrines should be made.

Before taking up any of these I would draw the attention of those who believe in the Upanishads to the constant insistence throughout those sacred books upon the identity of man with Brahma, or God, or nature, and to the universal application of all doctrines or laws.

In *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* it is said:*

"Tell me the Brahman which is visible, not invisible, the *atman* who is within all?

"This, thy Self who is within all. * * He who breathes in the up-breathing, he is thy Self and within all. He who breathes in the down-breathing, he is thy Self and within all. He who breathes in the on-breathing, he is thy Self and within all. This is thy Self who is within all."

The 6th Brahmana is devoted to showing that all the worlds are woven in and within each other; and in the 7th the teacher declares

*111 Adh., 4th Brah.

that "the puller" or mover in all things whatsoever is the same Self which is in each man.

The questioners then proceed and draw forth the statement that "what is above the heavens, beneath the earth, embracing heaven and earth, past, present, and future, that is woven, like warp and woof, in the ether," and that the ether is "woven like warp and woof in the Imperishable." If this be so, then any law that affects man must govern every portion of the universe in which he lives.

And we find these sturdy men of old applying their doctrines in every direction. They use the laws of analogy and correspondence to solve deep questions. Why need we be behind them? If the entire great Self dwells in man, the body in all its parts must symbolize the greater world about. So we discover that space having sound as its distinguishing characteristic is figured in the human frame by the ear, as fire is by the eye, and, again, the eye showing forth the soul, for the soul alone conquers death, and that which in the *Upanishads* conquers death is fire.

It is possible in this manner to proceed steadily toward the acquirement of a knowledge of the laws of nature, not only those that are recondite, but also the more easily perceived. If we grant that the human body and organs are a figure, in little, of the universe, then let us ask the question, "By what is the astral light symbolized?" By the eye, and specially by the retina and its mode of action. On the astral light are received the pictures of all events and things, and on the retina are received the images of objects passing before the man. We find that these images on the retina remain for a specific period, capable of measurement, going through certain changes before fading completely away. Let us extend the result of this observation to the astral light, and we assume that it also goes through similar changes in respect to the pictures. From this it follows that the mass or totality of pictures made during any cycle must, in this great retina, have a period at the end of which they will have faded away. Such we find is the law as stated by those who know the Secret Doctrine. In order to arrive at the figures with which to represent this period, we have to calculate the proportion thus: as the time of fading from the human retina is to the healthy man's actual due of life, so is the time of fading from the astral light. The missing term may be discovered by working upon the doctrine of the four yugas or ages and the length of one life of Brahma.

Now these theosophical doctrines which we have been at such pains to elaborate during all the years of our history are either

capable of universal application or they are not. If they are not, then they are hardly worth the trouble we have bestowed upon them; and it would then have been much better for us had we devoted ourselves to some special departments of science.

But the great allurement that theosophy holds for those who follow it is that its doctrines are universal, solving all questions and applying to every department of nature so far as we know it. And advanced students declare that the same universal application prevails in regions far beyond the grasp of present science or of the average man's mind. So that, if a supposed law or application is formulated to us, either by ourselves or by some other person, we are at once able to prove it; for unless it can be applied in every direction—by correspondence, or is found to be one of the phases of some previously-admitted doctrine, we know that it is false doctrine or inaccurately stated. Thus all our doctrines can be proved and checked at every step. It is not necessary for us to have constant communications with the Adepts in order to make sure of our ground; all that we have to do is to see if any position we assume agrees with well-known principles already formulated and understood.

Bearing this in mind, we can confidently proceed to examine the great ideas in which so many of us believe, with a view of seeing how they may be applied in every direction. For if, instead of selfishly considering these laws in their effect upon our miserable selves, we ask how they apply everywhere, a means is furnished for the broadening of our horizon and the elimination of selfishness. And when also we apply the doctrines to all our acts and to all parts of the human being, we may begin to wake ourselves up to the real task set before us.

Let us look at Karma. It must be applied not only to the man but also to the Cosmos, to the globe upon which he lives. You know that, for the want of an English word, the period of one great day of evolution is called a Manwantara, or the reign of one Manu. These eternally succeed each other. In other words, each one of us is a unit, or a cell, if you please, in the great body or being of Manu, and just as we see ourselves making Karma and reincarnating for the purpose of carrying off Karma, so the great being Manu dies at the end of a Manwantara, and after the period of rest reincarnates once more, the sum total of all that we have made him—or it. And when I say "we," I mean all the beings on whatever plane or planet who are included in that Manwantara. Therefore this Manwantara is just exactly what the last Manwantara made it, and so the

next Manwantara after this—millions of years off—will be the sum or result of this one, plus all that have preceded it.

How much have you thought upon the effect of Karma upon the animals, the plants, the minerals, the elemental beings? Have you been so selfish as to suppose that they are not affected by you? Is it true that man himself has no responsibility upon him for the vast numbers of ferocious and noxious animals, for the deadly serpents and scorpions, the devastating lions and tigers, that make a howling wilderness of some corners of the earth and terrorize the people of India and elsewhere? It cannot be true. But as the Apostle of the Christians said, it is true that the whole of creation waits upon man and groans that he keeps back the enlightenment of all. What happens when, with intention, you crush out the life of a common croton bug? Well, it is destroyed and you forget it. But you brought it to an untimely end, short though its life would have been. Imagine this being done at hundreds of thousands of places in the State. Each of these little creatures had life and energy; each some degree of intelligence. The sum total of the effects of all these deaths of small things must be appreciable. If not, then our doctrines are wrong and there is no wrong in putting out the life of a human being.

Let us go a little higher, to the bird kingdom and that of four-footed beasts. Every day in the shooting season in England vast quantities of birds are killed for sport, and in other places such intelligent and inoffensive animals as deer. These have a higher intelligence than insects, a wider scope of feeling. Is there no effect under Karma for all these deaths? And what is the difference between wantonly killing a deer and murdering an idiot? Very little to my mind. Why is it, then, that even delicate ladies will enjoy the recital of a bird or deer hunt? It is their Karma that they are the descendants of long generations of Europeans who some centuries ago, with the aid of the church, decided that animals had no souls and therefore could be wantonly slaughtered. The same Karma permits the grandson of the Queen of England who calls herself the defender of the faith—of Jesus—to have great preparations made for his forth-coming visit to India to the end that he shall enjoy several weeks of tiger-hunting, pig-sticking, and the destruction of any and every bird that may fly in his way.

We therefore find ourselves ground down by the Karma of our national stem, so that we are really almost unable to tell what thoughts are the counterfeit presentments of the thoughts of our forefathers, and what self-born in our own minds.

Let us now look at Reincarnation, Devachan, and Karma.

It has been the custom of theosophists to think upon these subjects in respect only to the whole man—that is to say, respecting the ego.

But what of its hourly and daily application? If we believe in the doctrine of the One Life, then every cell in these material bodies must be governed by the same laws. Each cell must be *a life* and have its karma, devachan, and reincarnation. Every one of these cells upon incarnating among the others in our frame must be affected by the character of those it meets; and we make that character. Every thought upon reaching its period dies. It is soon reborn, and coming back from its devachan it finds either bad or good companions provided for it. Therefore every hour of life is fraught with danger or with help. How can it be possible that a few hours a week devoted to theosophic thought and action can counteract—even in the gross material cells—the effect of nearly a whole week spent in indifference, frivolity, or selfishness? This mass of poor or bad thought will form a resistless tide that shall sweep away all your good resolves at the first opportunity.

This will explain why devoted students often fail. They have waited for a particular hour or day to try their strength, and when the hour came they had none. If it was anger they had resolved to conquer, instead of trying to conquer it at an offered opportunity they ran away from the chance so as to escape the trial; or they did not meet the hourly small trials that would, if successfully passed, have given them a great reserve of strength, so that no time of greater trial would have been able to overcome them.

Now as to the theory of evolution of the macrocosm in its application to the microcosm, man.

The hermetic philosophy held that man is a copy of the greater universe; that he is a little universe in himself, governed by the same laws as the great one, and in the small proportions of a human being showing all those greater laws in operation, only reduced in time or sweep. This is the rule to which H. P. Blavatsky adheres, and which is found running through all the ancient mysteries and initiations.

It is said that our universe is a collection of atoms or molecules—called also *"lives;"* living together and through each the spirit struggles to reach consciousness, and that this struggle is governed by a law compelling it to go on in or between periods. In any period of such struggle some of these atoms or collections of molecules are left over, as it were, to renew the battle in the next period, and hence the state of the universe at any time of manifestation—or the

state of each newly-manifested universe—must be the result of what was done in the preceding period.

Coming down to the man, we find that he is a collection of molecules or *lives* or cells, each striving with the other, and all affected for either good or bad results by the spiritual aspirations or want of them in the man who is the guide or god, so to say, of his little universe. When he is born, the molecules or cells or lives that are to compose his physical and astral forms are from that moment under his reign, and during the period of his smaller life they pass through a small manvantara just as the lives in the universe do, and when he dies he leaves them all impressed with the force and color of his thoughts and aspirations, ready to be used in composing the houses of other egos.

Now here is a great responsibility revealed to us of a double character.

The first is for effects produced on and left in what we call matter in the molecules, when they come to be used by other egos, for they must act upon the latter for benefit or the reverse.

The second is for the effect on the molecules themselves in this, that there are lives or entities in all—or rather they are all lives—who are either aided or retarded in their evolution by reason of the proper or improper use man made of this matter that was placed in his charge.

Without stopping to argue about what matter is, it will be sufficient to state that it is held to be co-eternal with what is called "spirit." That is, as it is put in the *Bhagavad-Gita:* "He who is spirit is also matter." Or, in other words, spirit is the opposite pole to matter of the Absolute. But of course this matter we speak of is not what we see about us, for the latter is only in fact phenomena of matter; even science holds that we do not really see matter.

Now during a manwantara or period of manifestation, the egos incarnating must use over and over again in any world upon which they are incarnating the matter that belongs to it.

So, therefore, we are now using in our incarnations matter that has been used by ourselves and other egos over and over again, and are affected by the various tendencies impressed in it. And, similarly, we are leaving behind us for future races that which will help or embarrass them in their future lives.

This is a highly important matter, whether reincarnation be a true doctrine or not. For if each new nation is only a mass of new egos or souls, it must be much affected by the matter-environment left behind by nations and races that have disappeared forever.

But for us who believe in reincarnation it has additional force, showing us one strong reason why universal brotherhood should be believed in and practiced.

The other branch of the responsibility is just as serious. The doctrine that removes death from the universe and declares that all is composed of innumerable lives, constantly changing places with each other, contains in it of necessity the theory that man himself is full of these lives and that all are traveling up the long road of evolution.

The secret doctrine holds that we are full of kingdoms of entities who depend upon us, so to say, for salvation.

How enormous, then, is this responsibility, that we not only are to be judged for what we do with ourselves as a whole, but also for what we do for those unseen beings who are dependent upon us for light. W. Q. J.

WILL AND DESIRE

WILL is the exclusive possession of man on this our plane of consciousness. It divides him from the brute in whom instinctive desire only is active.

DESIRE, in its widest application, is the one creative force in the Universe. In this sense it is indistinguishable from Will; but we men never know desire under this form while we remain only men. Therefore Will and Desire are here considered as opposed.

Thus Will is the offspring of the Divine, the God in man; Desire the motive power of the animal life.

Most men live in and by desire, mistaking it for will. But he who would achieve must separate will from desire, and make his will the ruler; for desire is unstable and ever changing, while will is steady and constant.

Both will and desire are absolute *creators,* forming the man himself and his surroundings. But will creates intelligently—desire blindly and unconsciously. The man, therefore, makes himself in the image of his desires, unless he creates himself in the likeness of the Divine, through his will, the child of the light.

His task is twofold: to awaken the will, to strengthen it by use and conquest, to make it absolute ruler within his body; and, parallel with this, to purify desire.

Knowledge and will are the tools for the accomplishment of this purification. —*Lucifer,* October, 1887.

INTROSPECTION ON FREE-WILL

HOW many real "choices" have I made? As I look back upon my past, it appears that many events have occurred in lines of development with which I had little to do. And things which afterward seemed to me matters of choice—regarding them now, were not my decisions determined in advance?

Perhaps I did what I thought I would not do, and yet did I *really* think so? Had I an intuition that what I finally did, I would do? And was this not true for both "good" and "evil" choices? Then, have not my associations with those I love, my present and past environment, molded my mind to a great extent? After my direct contact with Theosophy, did not the force of that new current seem to guide my steps automatically? Yet what had I done in this life to merit my connection with the Theosophical Movement? If all this came to be without real choice, does "choice" play any part at all in my life?

It seems that never have I made a "momentous" choice that was not finally traceable to a strong current from the past—stronger than the opposing influences. Yet, stay a moment! Do you recall one time, not so long ago, when the forces seemed genuinely equal on both sides of a necessary decision?—when you really felt the *struggle* of a choice in which no one could have predicted the outcome? But that was a relatively unimportant matter. I do remember feeling that it was a real decision, unlike others I have been recalling, but it seemed so small a thing. Free-will would only be real to me if I could see that the most important things in my life were decided deliberately in such a manner. Well, are you sure that the moment you speak of was so "unimportant"?

As I think more of it, perhaps it meant a great deal;—yes, I can see that strong lines of Karma were involved. And if I had chosen otherwise, the whole trend of my life might easily have been altered. Was that not, then, a major choice? It must have been, and perhaps in such ways great choices come to us—not advertised as tremendous moral problems which we can take pride in solving, but presenting themselves as simple alternatives. We may be entirely unsuspecting as to the consequences.

In some lives, perhaps, no periods of real choice occur; may be several incarnations roll by before such a moment comes; while, for other souls, there may be many critical decisions during one lifetime.

But what of the rest of my own life, when no such important decision confronts? Perhaps the truly decisive element in the millions of seeming choices I made is in the amount of will I have expended in channeling my mind toward moral ideals and ennobling philosophy. Then, if such currents of thought rule my life, so that many decisions seem "automatic" or predestined, I have really made the choices myself, even in this life, by mental and moral preparation.

INEFFACEABLE MEMORIES

Our spontaneous action is always the best. You cannot, with your best deliberation and heed, come so close to any question as your spontaneous glance shall bring you, whilst you rise from your bed, or walk abroad in the morning after meditating the matter before sleep, on the previous night. Always our thinking is a pious reception. Our truth of thought is therefore vitiated as much by too violent direction given by our will, as by too great negligence. We do not determine what we will think. We only open our senses, clear away, as we can, all obstruction from the fact, and suffer the intellect to see. We have little control over our thoughts. We are the prisoners of ideas. They catch us up for moments into their heaven, and so fully engage us, that we take no thought for the morrow, gaze like children, without an effort to make them our own. By-and-by we fall out of that rapture, bethink us where we have been, what we have seen, and repeat, as truly as we can, what we have beheld. As far as we can recall these ecstasies, we carry away in the ineffaceable memory, the result, and all men and all the ages confirm it. It is called Truth. But the moment we cease to report, and attempt to correct and contrive, it is not truth.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

THEOSOPHIST UNAWARE

I: Bronson Alcott, the Man

BRONSON ALCOTT, on August 21, 1848, confided this comparison between himself and Emerson to his private journal: "Emerson lived in and represented the life and time in which he lived, an historian of the past. But A. was not contemporary with him, though cast upon the same time, but dwelt solely in the future, leaving little or no impress on his time, or taking any from it.—A seer of the events and ideas of the next century." Earlier, in 1846, Alcott had written, "for me the time is not quite ready." Emerson, too, realized that Alcott was a planter of seeds for the future, for he said, "Come again in a hundred years and then compare Alcott and his little critics."

Alcott brought new forms and interpretations to truths as old as mankind, and, as with Giordano Bruno and others of glorious but calumniated reputation, his contemporaries little recognized the value of his work. But Alcott was content in the belief that he labored for posterity. "Hope," he wrote in his journal, "is my sight."

Born on November 29, 1799, Alcott early learned the force of the ruling opinions and prejudices. He cherished no dreams of popularity. At twenty-eight, he recorded in his journal:

> Our life is to be devoted to the amelioration of our fellow beings, in attempts to establish the reign of truth and reason. . . . We are aware that the projects which we contemplate are opposed to the ruling opinions and prejudices of the age, and that we shall render ourselves unpopular and be deemed visionary and an enthusiast. We care little about these things. Our opinions have not been formed prematurely. They are the result of experience with mankind, of deliberate conviction, the dictates of common sense exerted upon the common affairs of life.

Alcott, like Jacob Boehme, was a self-educated man. He had no formal education after the age of thirteen. But he belonged to that rare company of men and women who go straight to the heart of things, who find the old trail of truth beneath the clutter of false ideas of the age. Odell Shepard, in his study of Alcott's journal, gives a pleasing picture of the eighteen-year-old lad, who, after leaving his father's Connecticut farm, travelled on foot through the South, as a salesman. "Alcott suggested in his old age," Shepard says, that the planters' dogs did not attack him when he entered

their premises because they "recognized in him not so much a pedlar, as the spirit of Pythagoras come back to earth." Young Alcott's manner and conversation were so engaging that many a time the mistress of the house would invite him to stay, and at dinner, the master of the house, fascinated by the discourse of the handsome, blue-eyed Yankee, would ask him to remain as a guest.

During his four years of tramping through the towns and cities of the South, Alcott had many opportunities to read in the fine library of more than one hospitable home. He records how he saturated himself with matters upon which he meditated during the long walks from place to place. Emerson relates that Alcott "could go into any strange library and lay his hand at once on the one book that he most needed to read, even if he did not know the language."

He taught school for eleven years in Connecticut and Massachustts. In 1834 he opened the famous Temple School in Boston where he sought to "prepare the child to aid himself." He believed that "the province of the instructor should be simple, awakening, invigorating, directing, rather than the forcing of the child's faculties upon prescribed and exclusive courses of thought"; that "the manner of Jesus and Plato is authority, were any needed, to show what the mind requires in order to be quickened and renewed."

The children were happy in Temple School, and the stenographic reports taken by Elizabeth Peabody, his assistant, and published in the *Record of a School,* show how effectively they were learning to think for themselves. But as Alcott had predicted, the opposition of conventional minds was gradually aroused, and by 1838 so many children had been withdrawn by orthodox parents that he closed the school.

By 1837 Alcott had already published one volume of the *Conversations on the Gospels.* He now brought out a second volume which is said to have been denounced by a Harvard professor as compounded of nonsense and blasphemy. Mild enough these books and ideas seem today, but so great was the furor against Alcott that he expected any day to be the victim of Boston mob violence. Children reflecting the attitude of their elders hooted at him on the street. In the preface to *The Father of Little Women* (1927), Honoré Morrow says that her mother, a New Englander, had great respect for Alcott and declared that the prejudiced rejection of his ideas had delayed education by one hundred years.

What appeared as bitter setbacks seem to have affected little what Alcott called his "inner nature." As the pattern of his life becomes

clear, one sees that he was going steadily forward with the application of his principles. In 1843 the Alcott family, consisting of his wife, Abba, whom he had married in 1830, and his four girls, together with Charles Lane and his son, established the "Fruitlands" community. This experiment in social and economic life did not last long, but Alcott recorded the value of this experience, as well as the lessons of the next few years spent farming, in "The Orchard," or "The Husbandman," which is still an unpublished manuscript.

Despite all difficulties and obstacles, Alcott found time to carry on "Conversations" as if he were indeed Socrates returned, attempting to arouse by dialogue the sleepy Americans as he had the ancient Athenians. In Boston, where the Alcott family moved in 1849, Alcott conducted Conversations for adults. The titles included in the first series are especially arresting for the Theosophist: Man Monadic, Man Embryonic, Man Natural, Man Demonic, Man Humane, Man Intellectual, and Man Divine. Between 1853 and 1882 he made ten lecture tours west of the Hudson, travelling through New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri. His last tour, made at eighty-one years of age, occupied seven months. He spoke in thirty-seven towns and cities, sometimes three times in one day. Who can measure the influence of these Conversations? Oral tradition, appropriately enough, has served to keep green the memory of this great man in many hearts.

During the summers of 1879 to 1888, Alcott conducted the Concord School of Philosophy. He published five books in his last twenty years, including a volume of poetry in 1882. When he died, on March 4, 1888, he left the manuscripts of several books, and, still unpublished, a vast body of material, five million words, in the fifty volumes of his journal.

True teachers are always exiles from the masses and their orthodox leaders. But Alcott reveals that he had at least one friend who knew him truly, who was a companion to whom he could open his heart. A journal entry for May 8, 1853, reads: "All morning in the library at the old game, discussing unreportable things with Emerson."

Not even in his journal did he record those "unreportable" ideas, but the character of his discussions with Emerson may be gathered from entries like the following:

> Man is older than nature. The synthesis of his being is broader. Nature is included within it. Matter, both organic and inorganic, are consequent and sequels of his birth. He is older than either, and

survives all their changes. Nature is the Soul's cast-off wardrobe. Behold traces of his build and habits in it.

. . . not the forms merely, but the materials of natural things, are preconceived in man's mind, and put forth as the Nature we survey externally. Nature is mind in solution—the waste of spent man. Without man matter were not, nor Nature.

[Theodore] Parker asked me today, on my saying that men must have behaved well in order to have such fine sunshine, what I would do with the Mosaic account, which gives the priority of creation to the elements. I said that was the historical, not genetic, account of the matter. It was the story told in the order of the senses. The man and nature are. The senses begin in the concrete, and analyze from the surface to the center. But this is not the order of generation. The Soul is prior to the elements of nature. It was the Soul which said " 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Light is generated from the Soul, and is the base of matter.

The common atmosphere of the earth is said to be more than forty miles in altitude. Let all souls be pure, and this would be sweet and envigorating, void of miasmas and pestilences. For what is the atmosphere but the reflex current of all the living souls on the planet, returning on its ebb to be renewed and impelled with vital force in sustaining floods over the world, expired and inspired by the all-renewing Soul? Let all men see to it that they sweeten the airs of God by vitalized deeds, and not live on the lungs of their neighbors. Disease comes riding on every gale to such. Holiness neutralizes miasmas, and renovates the atmospheric tides; so a sweet soul circulates around the globe, and sends health to panting, yawning, languishing invalids on every breath that it launches into the common current. Like ocean, it tumbles round the world, and stirs the whole mass of fluid air.

When thirty-seven years of age, Alcott made the following emphatic judgment: "I say that the Christian world is anti-Christ." Some years later, H. P. Blavatsky was to observe: "In almost every point the doctrines of the churches and the practices of Christians are *in direct opposition to the teachings of Jesus.*" (THEOSOPHY, I, 132.)

As early as 1853, Alcott recorded his attitude toward going to church:

Church-going: this enters not, as a necessary element into my plan of life. Neither is it an episode in my life's drama. I am not conscious of growth from attendance on the preached Word. Other minds do not affect my views of the spiritual truths of the Bible. I find greater enjoyment in my own interpretations. Add to this the little uninterrupted leisure that my profession leaves me for

> self-retiring thought and meditative insight; and I feel that I owe my own mind the duty of yielding up to its inner movements one day in seven. Why should I put it under the direction of another? Why turn myself out-of-doors in order to let in strangers? Why distrust myself so constantly as to give myself up to another—and that, too, on subjects upon which my own mind yearns for time to dwell in the quiet of self-seclusion? Why go to church to think—or rather, to have my thoughts put out of their natural sequence and growth, according to the wonted associations of my spirit?

He was looking for an expression of religion "in its divine sense" and watched with interest the movement founded as a branch of Unitarianism "to encourage the scientific study of theology." While approving this stepping-stone from old creeds, he feared the other extreme: "They are likely to overstep the mark and plunge into Positivism or something worse. In pleading for science they discredit religion in its divine sense and sink divinity in humanity." Alcott, as Shepard puts it, "had not the slightest touch of that fear of science which is sometimes attributed to the more orthodox Christians of his time. On the contrary, his complaint was that science halted and lingered on its way, and was by far too cautious and careful."

His habit with scientific "discoveries" was to appropriate the results, and, in the true "scientific method" of Plato and H. P. B., present them in their proper relation to the *laws* of Life:

> God publishes himself in facts, whether of the corporeal or spiritual world. These are his words. He composes his Gospel in facts. He reveals himself in faculties and organs, and the one is but instrument of the other. What is physical science but an illustration of the order, and statement of the laws, of spiritual science? What but the cypher in which soul is denoted in the forms of matter? What but the language by which soul is made palpable and obvious to the human senses? And hence the need of arming the intellect with such facts, as instruments of scientific demonstration. The poet, seer, philosopher, saint—each perceives the significance of such facts, and each, according to his faculty of insight, presents it to the same faculty in others of his race.

Alcott's journal reveals that he was aware of the increasing evidence of the characteristics of the forthcoming sixth sub-race:

> The age of insight and intuition is fast evicting that of observation and inference. From using contentedly the old eyes of a circuitous and painful logic, men are finding the superior power of a direct and instant intuition in all investigations of nature and spirit.

Alcott, like H. P. B., addressed the meetings of the Spiritualists, but with discouraging results. Laconically, he reports:

> Awhile at the Spiritualists' Convention which is sitting—or sleeping, rather—in the Masonic Temple; and volunteer some rays of what we called "sunlight," to find the same somewhat annoying to the recumbents. And so we desisted, and left them to their preferred lunacies.

Patience exhausted, in 1856 he disposed of Spiritualism with a passage that suggests H. P. B.'s comment on mere phenomenalism:

> Attended a Conversation at Dr. B.'s [Henry Whitney Bellows] on "Spiritualism" . . . This apotheosis of idiocy and fatuity only serves to betray the latent atheism and dark superstition of multitudes in our time, and the need of some spiritual discernment and culture to detect and banish these grim goblin gods here enthroned from the vacant popular mind. Yet the ghastly superstition is spreading fast and wide, and is to have its victims and its day. Nor need we wonder in the least at this calamity when we consider the superficial, not to say no-teaching of the multitude in the elements of metaphysics and of the spiritual life. The oracles are dumb; and if any proof need be cited in confirmation of the shallow infidelity and the current stupidity, it is to be found in the calling of this direst of all materialism of any people or time by the fair name "Spiritualism," and a "philosophy" besides.

Ten years later, he wrote:

> Speak to the Spiritualists on the revolution now in process in religious philosophy. Is not this spiritualism, poor as most of it is, and a misnomer withal, the only religion that may rightly claim to be of American origin? Its chief claim is that it is breaking up the old superstitions and preparing the way for a positive faith.

Alcott's prophetic intuition is suggestively revealed by a passage entering in his journal in 1837:

> The day is not far distant when minds of creative genius, true lovers of humanity, shall associate for its regeneration. To this every sign of the times now points. Men intent on separate evils shall at last be led to the parent principle, which is to kill every abuse and usage and establish truth in the common mind.

And in 1839:

> . . . a few years will bring changes in the opinions and institutions of our time of which few now dream. All things are coming to judgment, and there is nothing true and sacred now that shall pass this time unharmed. All things are doomed. The eye of justice searches the hearts of men, and the secrets of all evils and wrongs are made known. . . . A band of valiant souls is gathering for conflict with the hosts of ancient and honorable errors and sins. These shall assuredly overthrow the Ideas now standing in our High Places and do somewhat to restore the worship of the True and Living God in the hearts of men. I would be of and with these in their work.

Alcott sought a true lover of humanity, one with organizing genius, who would lead men to worship the true and living God in the hearts of man, more than once saying that a woman would be the next "prophetess." Shepard tells us he was "all his life on the lookout for that prophetess, that 'sibyl,' as he loved to call her, who should speak forth the things of the Spirit as never man had spoken."

The "Sibyl" came and spake as never man spake before. A woman, H. P. Blavatsky, breaking the silence of centuries, came not to one race or nation, but as teacher of the world, to all men of whatever class or creed to unite on the basis Alcott described as "the parent principle, which is to kill every abuse and usage and establish truth in the common mind."

Appeal to Social Reformers

. . . . it is evident that it is not to the establishment of new forms that the activity of men desirous of serving their neighbor should be directed, but to the alteration and perfecting of their own characters and those of other people. . . . The alteration of the character and life-conception of men inevitably brings with it the alteration of those forms in which men had lived, whereas the alteration of the forms of life not only does not contribute to the alteration of the character and life-conception of men, but, more than anything else, obstructs this alteration by directing the attention and activity of men into a false channel. . . . Thus there is only one means of serving men, which consists in oneself living a good life. And not only is this means not visionary—as it is regarded by those to whom it is not advantageous,—but all other means are visionary, by which the leaders of the masses allure them into a false way, distracting them from that method which alone is true.

So that all I have here said amounts to the simple, generally comprehensible, and irrefutable truth: that in order that good life should exist amongst men it is necessary that men should be good.

There is only one way of influencing men towards a good life: namely, to live a good life oneself. Therefore the activity of those who desire to contribute to the establishment of good life amongst men can and should only consist in efforts towards inner perfection—in the fulfillment of that which is expressed in the Gospel by the words: "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven."

—Leo Tolstoy.

THE MIND BODY

THERE are two modes of thought, the objective and the subjective; the former compels the mind to depend upon outer stimulation for its train of thought, whereas the latter releases the spiritual energy of abstract ideation. The lower mind, absorbed in the life of the personality, obscures and inhibits the subjective mode. When absorbed in objective thinking the lower mind calls forth its vast stores of memory, producing a condition during which any new direction is dependent upon interception or stimulation from without; in other words, the senses may possess the mind. Further, under such possession, a strong distaste arises for any introspective study of the thinking principle as an instrument. Such study requires egoic control of thought, the first necessary step toward building the moral structure of any given life. The karma of mind in the individual, and the race, is revealed in the rise and fall of families as well as nations. Wise indeed are those who, in this tragic period of world history, are willing to stay the objective trend of thought and to give serious study to the mind itself.

Generally speaking, the science of our day assigns all processes of the mind to the brain, considering the action of its molecules within the cells, stimulated by the sense organs, as sufficient cause for the emergence of ideas and the processes of thought. But this point of view assigns to matter that which it exhibits in no other condition, and man is thereby reduced to a physical automaton. A being whose thoughts arise from the action of the molecules of the brain stuff could be accorded both consciousness and memory, but the possession of these attributes of matter would in no case explain the presence in man of self-consciousness, the power of choice, or the power to reason. Today we see the automatism of mind, a theoretic heritage of nineteenth century materialism, breaking down under the light of fast accumulating facts of science.

What, we may ask, is the evidence that intellectual processes are dependent on or a reflection of the metabolic processes—chemical exchange—of the brain cells? None at all, according to Dr. Alexis Carrel. Let us quote a passage from his *Man the Unknown,* an epoch-making book:

> "The intensity of chemical exchanges in the cell communities, or in the entire being, expresses the intensity of organic life. Metabolism is measured by the quantity of oxygen absorbed and that of carbonic acid produced, when the body is in a state of complete repose. This is called basal metabolism. . . . Intellectual work,

> strange to say, does not increase metabolism. It seems to require no energy, or to consume a quantity of it too small to be detected by our present techniques (p. 81).

Although thought assigned to a physical basis may seem to require no energy, it might be found to require energies unknown to science if the true basis for intellectual action could be accepted as fact. The atom is endowed with far greater potentialities than the electron microscope will reveal, possessing, besides the physical, psychic and spiritual principles. Through these principles all matter is connected with three planes of existence. In man each one of the planes has its corresponding basis or body, the physical alone occupying the attention of science. Whenever the energies of the inner bodies are detected they are attributed to physical origin. But energy is known to function only through that for which it has an affinity. For example, electricity is repelled by rubber, but has an affinity for metal such as copper. By analogy, occult electricity, or *Fohat,* must have its repulsions and affinities. In repelling electricity, rubber, nevertheless, may serve to insulate copper so that it completely contains the flashing current. The brain, too, may serve to insulate and completely contain the finer energies of thought, remaining unaffected so far as modern means of observation are concerned.

Any approach to an understanding of mental phenomena must include a study of the basic part played by memory, coupled with some approach to the abstruse question of the cohesive forces governing the substance of the mind body. Let us therefore turn to another passage taken from the same scientific source for evidence that memory is observable in the action of the cells, enabling them to cohere. No body as such can retain its shape and volume without the power of organic memory, for it produces cohesion among the molecules in the same way that "discipline" assembles the units of an army. Dr. Carrel writes:

> The cells seem to remember their original unity, even when they have become the elements of an innumerable multitude. They know spontaneously the functions attributed to them in the organized whole. If we cultivate epithelial cells over a period of several months, quite apart from the animal to which they belong, they arrange themselves in a mosaic, exactly as if to protect a surface. Yet the surface to be protected is lacking. . . .
>
> The spontaneous tendency toward formation of the organs by their constitutive cells, like the aptitude of the insects, is a primary datum of observation. It cannot be explained in the light of our present concepts (p. 106).

Present scientific concepts do not take into consideration the Theosophical teaching that all matter has its roots in states not observable by the outer senses. Therefore, having at our disposal ample evidence of phenomena to be noted on the physical plane, we can follow the revealing logic of analogy to examine that which takes place in the finer states of matter.

It is the cohesive force of the spiritual entity coming into incarnation that draws together the necessary instruments he is to use. Through his connection with the purely monadic stream of evolution the ego obtains a physical body, brought to its present state of perfection through countless eons of evolution, during which the monad has overshadowed matter of all degrees. The memory of this evolutionary experience, indelibly impressed upon physical matter, accounts for the facility shown in all physical processes.

The mental evolution is energized directly by the manasic reincarnating ego, and the mental sheath or body he draws together is called the manasa-rupa. In the prenatal state the astral body is "perfect in shape," and the physical body builds itself upon this astral mold, drawing its material from the blood stream of the mother. The astral embryo is a complete index to the assembling physical cells, and each page of the index is checked by Karma. The far more subtle substance of the mind body, or manasa-rupa, achieves its cohesive momentum more gradually, completing itself at some point before maturity, for in infancy the mind is still in its embryonic or potential state. Where, then, does the substance of the mind body originate?

Caution must be had when attempting to understand the Theosophical teachings regarding substance. To begin with, the terms, matter and substance, appear to be interchangeable, especially when the primordial state is under consideration. Patanjali refers to a meditation which reaches to primordial matter, whereas in *The Secret Doctrine* all phenomena are said to rest upon primordial substance. But regardless of whether the two are to be considered identical, one thing is certain—the western mind is not prepared through training and heredity to follow these fine distinctions of spiritual metaphysics, for they deal with the highest degree of substance the trained mind can conceive of. Akasa radiates from the Primordial Substance, yet it is stated that "the Primordial Substance is Akasa." (*S. D.* I, 326.) It is to be noted, however, that Primordial Substance has no qualifications, but is spoken of as the basis of all that follows in manifestation. Akasa, on the other hand, con-

tains the secret of the infinite complexity of mind in man and in nature.

The teaching that one state of substance radiates or emanates from a more homogeneous state reveals the true basis for evolution. It postulates a state of oneness or unity from which number or heterogeneity can proceed. This teaching also clears away the mistaken idea that evolution begins from below, for in the beginning of a cycle of evolution Unity represents the highest rate or That from which the first, or Primordial, Substance emanates. To the untrained mind this substance would be that Unity, and therefore a tendency exists to consider the first degree of manifestation as something which had its existence only at the inception of a period of evolution. But to correct this impression, wherever it may exist, let us quote *The Secret Doctrine:*

> What, then, is the "Primordial Substance," that mysterious object of which Alchemy was ever talking. . . . ? We touch and do not feel it; we look at it without seeing it; we breathe it and do not perceive it; we hear and smell it without the smallest cognition that it is there; for it is in every molecule of that which in our illusion and ignorance we regard as Matter in any of its states, or conceive of as a feeling, a thought, an emotion. . . . In short, it is the "upadhi," or vehicle, of every possible phenomenon, whether physical, mental, or psychic (I, 330).

Let one ponder this statement for what it reveals relative to phenomena, until a conception is obtained of the meaning of "substance" as a vehicle or basis; for, manifestly, substance must be that which is homogeneous on the plane where we perceive the phenomenon.

Consider a piece of paper and then watch as it is devoured by fire. Are we to consider the paper as the basis for fire? Hardly, because fire will reduce to ashes many forms of matter; innumerable solids, liquids, and gases are all resolvable in flame. Then there must be a basis for fire other than the matter consumed, and although it can be shown that oxygen and hydrogen combine to cause fire, the true basis is that which causes this combination or any other combination. In like manner we must turn to the substance from which the manasarupa is derived in order to explore the vehicle for thought. The physical instrument, or brain, must not be considered as this vehicle, and thus confuse that which makes intellectual action possible on this plane with the basis itself.

The above quotation from *The Secret Doctrine* leaves no doubt that all phenomena within man, as well as those in the world about him, have as their basis Primordial Substance. The structure and

substance of the mind body must therefore be correlated to this universal basis. Fifth state matter, although close to its source, the Akasa, is not too far removed from the finer grades of physical matter to inhibit its energies from operating readily through the astral and physical aspects of the brain. Fifth state matter is immediately responsive to thought, being far more homogeneous as a plane than the stuff of our physical world.

Primordial Substance is the inner boundary, as it were, of material existence. Beyond this basic support of the phenomenal world lie the illimitable depths of Cosmic Ideation, or the universe of spirit. "The other planes (those of spirit) too far transcend the average consciousness . . . to admit of their being even symbolized in terms of ordinary phraseology." (*S. D.* II, 315.) It is well to bear this in mind in the face of claims to higher knowledge and adeptship, for the sincere student of "average consciousness" may rest assured that within the universe of matter, sharply delineated by Primordial Substance, lie ample reaches for the growth of his spiritualized conscious perceptions.

The pattern of thought built up during the life of the individual necessarily coarsens or refines the mind substance. Through the ever present register of memory in all departments of our being the ruling affinities are created. They are the seeds of individual Karma, and are so deep-seated and mysterious that eventually man is impelled to act without knowing why he acts. He fertilizes these seeds by his incessant thinking, without being able to give direction to his thoughts, and if this state of irresponsibility is not arrested, he finally succumbs to disease or even to self-destruction, not realizing the causes which brought about his ruin. He is nevertheless responsible for these affinities—the cohesive forces set up by memory. The constitutive substance of his instruments, those of body, brain, desire, and mind, are all of a degree corresponding to, and correlated with, his life's meditation. So closely allied are energy and substance on the inner planes, especially that of mind, that the distinction between the two becomes less and less as the basis of all phenomena is approached. For this reason the distinction drawn between thought and action on the external material plane must not be held to exist on the plane of mind. Thought is action on that plane, and this explains the teaching that "man is made of thought," for substance is impressed by ideation.

The quality of our consciousness depends upon the changing vehicle through which it functions, but the foundation substance upon which phenomena rest does not change. If it were not so, no man

could redeem himself, but would be eternally at the mercy of a sea of vitiated matter—a mere automaton without moral and spiritual direction. Because of the Primordial Substance the mind can be trained to relate its intellectual activities with all the ego perceives throughout Great Nature—that vast collectivity of conscious entities which is our universe. Through this expanded vision he learns the futility of the intensely personal life, jealously centered in the physical body. The awakened spiritual will at last enables him to grasp the guiding thread with which he is led unerringly back through the maze of matter constructed by his own thinking. Actually, the thread has always been at hand, and it may be used by all alike. It is the thread of spiritual discernment which enables the consciousness to experience in the finer planes of substance. Without experience there can be no memory; without the help of memory no new and corrective affinities can be set up. The Manasa-Rupa, the link between spirit and matter, can be purified or dragged down by the attractions established by thought, and the ego is responsible for either condition.

Thinker At Work

Beyond the dreaming stage, which is a very short stage of sleep, there is a vast extent of human thought and action. We go in and in until we are close to the source of our own being, where the Thinker is at work, where he knows all that he has been before—all his past incarnations—where he sees and knows himself as he is. The memory of all the experiences through which he has been as an individualized being is there in one consecutive whole. That, indeed, was the Paradise of man, when he walked with Deity, when he knew himself as he really was. True memory is the Paradise which all human beings should strive to regain. To recover that whole memory, to make that great knowledge of the past usable, here and now in the brain and in the body, is the true work of "salvation."

—Robert Crosbie.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

THERE'S something I'd like to know," began Gail. "What part should the arts play in the life of a Theosophist? I know that music, art and literature give people a lot of pleasure, but I've never analyzed that pleasure or tried to find its value."

"Literature has a telling effect on the soul," offered King. "The pen, appealing as it does to the human mind, is mightier than the sword, which is the weapon of brute force. Both good and evil can be effected by writers. Look at the way a story like *Uncle Tom's Cabin* aroused people to the injustices of slavery in the South!"

"The books you read will influence your outlook on life, all right," Janice chimed in. "Sometimes a person's future will be changed because of a book. Books present to the mind ideas more or less tinged with emotion, but I can't exactly see how painting and music do this. Do you ever get anything but emotion from music?"

"I think music *can* be inspiring," answered Gail, who was taking music appreciation at school. "Especially some of the great symphonies and tone poems. And, to me, the more beautiful church music is very moving."

"You're right—church music is moving," broke in King. "But I don't like it. It's too—'passive-fying'! I've always thought it fostered the mental passivity necessary for the best reception of—not ideas, but *suggestions* from the religious leader. I think it induces purely emotional ecstasy, instead of stimulating mental action."

"I enjoy the better type of modern music," said Alayne. "To me it's a sort of amplification of the surge of life all around us. The pulsing of the waves, the beating of the heart—everything has a beat; and the music of today catches that infectious rhythm. There is so much life and enthusiasm in it that I don't wonder so many young people prefer it to 'quieter' music."

"Ah, swing!" said George, lifting himself up from a semi-reclining position and preparing to take an interest in the proceedings. (George, younger than the others, had come for the first time.)

"He's off!" groaned Dave, who regarded George's taste in music as slightly crude.

"Well," began George, defensively, "while swing is hardly going to bring about unselfishness, there must be something to it or why would it be so popular, or so widespread among American youth? And I don't see why you can't enjoy swing, even if you aren't able to understand it!"

"It doesn't take much to understand swing," Dave grunted. "As a matter of fact, maybe the less you try to understand it or think about it, the better you'll like it." He grinned at George.

"Hold on," said King. "I don't think we ought to spend too much time trying to find the finer side of swing. Dancing to it is an athletic undertaking. Besides, no one in his right mind has ever pretended that swing is really 'music.' It's just rhythm for a special kind of dancing, so let's forget about it."

"Now fiction, for instance," he continued decisively. "Fiction has its place because some minds may contact in fiction *ideas* they would not otherwise meet under their present circumstances. There are fiction writers who honestly believe that people's minds can be turned to the Truth through fiction, and such sincerity of motive cannot fail to attract good results, in terms of the lighting up of some minds. But what is a good policy in regard to fiction?"

"Well," offered Gail, "having the basis, we should be able to tell, before reading too many pages, whether or not to finish a popular book. All good writing, no matter how fanciful, either portrays or is originated by psychological complexes that need to be understood in terms of philosophy. Those experiences which are not within our own field seem fictional to us, but may be reality for another. Often we see how trivial our own troubles are when we read of the problems of others. Then, too, we awaken to the fact that others have to face the same trials that we do. We realize that a certain type of experience is common to all of us. When we begin to wonder why this is so, we've taken a first step on the road to Brotherhood, I would think."

"We certainly should guard against a tendency to use fiction solely as amusement," added King. "This is moving in the direction of the escapist, and making fiction, in a sense, an opiate, or a psychic 'drug'."

"I know what you mean," said Janice. "Remember that part in the *Voice* where it says, 'Mistrust thy senses, they are false.' Although we would never be aware of anything without our power to see, hear or feel, we should not place our center of consciousness in our sensations. The senses exist for the mind's use. They gather material for the mind to work with, they are the contact between the mind and the 'clay' it is engaged in molding into shape. If art caters solely to our senses, not *through* them to the mind, it is unprofitable, because the Ego is not thereby stimulated to any action."

"That point is well illustrated in what Van Wyck Brooks calls the 'coterie' poets, as distinguished from the great poets," contributed

Dave. "The 'coterie' artists are those who get caught up in versification fads, so to speak, in the transitory schools of poetic theory. They become intoxicated with words, sound, or verse pattern. They lose themselves in the delight of pure image-making, caring little, so long as they produce a picture, about the meaning or lack of meaning suggested. They descend to private languages, mere patter, or streams of 'consciousness.' With the great artist style is not the man, but man is the master and creator of style. The great artist, says Brooks, is the great man thinking, and just as words to express our ideas come to us without conscious effort on our part, so a style or medium presents itself to the artist without interrupting, coloring, or in any way affecting his thought. It is for him a vehicle, not a hobbyhorse."

"I still don't see how a painting or a statue can inspire anybody, or contribute any ideas," spoke up George. "I sometimes wonder why men have goaded themselves from age to age to 'evolve the great art,' as they say."

"You must have been reading about the oriental artists who spend hours, days,—years almost—just looking at cherry blossoms, tree twigs, or waves, as the case may be," returned Gail. "And when they get all through studying their subject, and actually paint it, they may put in only one blossom, one twig, or one wave breaking on a rock."

"Yes, and what thoughts can you possibly get from that?" George was pressing on determinedly.

"Perhaps it's not what you get out of such art, but what you put in it, that makes it meaningful," suggested Gail. "Wouldn't it 'provoke' you in the true sense of the word, and tend to call out your own ideas? In a way, oriental art, instead of giving the thought, gives the symbol or illustration for it and leaves us to discover the connection. It is the idea of seeing in the blade of grass, 'the journeywork of the stars,' and in the mouse, 'a miracle to stagger sextillions of infidels,' as Whitman did. It may take an artist to comprehend an artist, to a certain point, but then a little imagination goes a long way."

"Which reminds me," said King. "Did you know that Tolstoy maintained that most of our art, including literature, is all wrong? He based this on the knowledge that only the 'educated' are able to appreciate what we call 'great' painting, the wonderful essay or the elaborate symphony. The 'uneducated' masses prefer simpler art, and these people are morally better, on the whole, than the so-called

'cultured' minority. The peasant readily gave his life for his king, and had great courage, patience, love, loyalty,—all the qualities which the highest art should foster. So, Tolstoy decided, if the ordinary man remained unimpressed by what was supposed to be great art, it was a sign that that art was not really high at all, but low and often sensual."

"It's interesting that the level of music, art and literature in a civilization shows the moral quality of that civilization. When the moral character of a people decays, their arts decay," put in Janice, "just like the principles coming apart at death. When the Ego, or the moral nature leaves, the rest has no more meaning."

"Art seems to involve the emotional or psychic nature directly," said Alayne. "Perhaps 'morals' may be aroused through the medium of the psychic nature, as well as through the mind? Lafcadio Hearn speaks of the highest art as that which awakens moral qualities in us. In his *Talks to Writers* he says, 'If moral beauty be the very highest possible form of beauty, then the highest possible form of art should be that which expresses it.' Then he goes on to point out that the loftiest kind of art should produce in us a moral effect that can be compared to love. When we love, our first impulse is one of self-sacrifice—the desire to perform any difficult task or even die for the sake of the loved one. Love of religion or of country may produce this same emotion."

"Then the kind of art which will satisfy the higher nature of man, and impel him to unselfish action, is the best and most needed by humanity," concluded King. "There must be possibilities and opportunities for those artists of whatever medium, who have the imagination to conceive of high ideals and the ability to express them to others."

The physical drama itself cannot touch us until someone points out its spiritual sense. —ANTOINE DE SAINT-EXUPERY.

A LIVING PHILOSOPHY

SOME men never speak of their convictions because they do not have any, but there are others whose silence is founded on humility. In the latter a kind of soul integrity produces repugnance for the glib repetition of abstract ideas, a distrust of too much facility. With them the impulse to speak comes only when their ideas arise from the fulness of personal experience, and then what they have to say bears the straightforward impact of conviction, the sincerity of living philosophy.

All students of Theosophy must on occasion feel humbled by the greatness of the ideas they study and repeat, as compared with their limited personal knowledge, the fruit of individual application. What, indeed, do we "know," compared to the knowledge that belongs to the Teachers? With what right do we practice so much assurance in proposing these ideas to others as the Wisdom of the Ages?

True, this wisdom is ours only in its merest beginning—our faith is greater than our knowledge; but it is a faith built upon the deep-seated intuitions of the soul and the judgment of the mind. It is a faith, moreover, that may continually pass through the alchemical transmutation of living experience, thereby growing into the knowledge toward which all men aspire.

The theosophist rises from personal humility, gaining the courage to speak about his philosophy by realizing within himself the true attitude of all Theosophical promulgation. He does not say, "Behold, I know," but, "Thus have I heard." This is the open sesame of his heart's conviction. Not merely personal certainty lends force to his discourse, but the whole company of the Predecessors speak through him, if he will think of himself as a *transmitter*. And any other attitude would be a monumental arrogance!

Yet personal conviction, too, has its place. A man becomes fit to speak of the larger scope of Theosophic truth only through his endeavor to live out those ideas he *can* practice, here and now. "Universal Brotherhood" is a cant phrase in the mouth of the one who gossips about his next-door neighbor, or bitterly condemns the "benighted" politics of a fellow. Emotive intensity in proclaiming that "all is Life" is suspect from the start when he who says it is peculiarly irresponsible in his use of the familiar tools and instruments of daily living. How long would a careful mechanic study philosophy from one who has little thought for the proper care of machinery?

The dialectical skill of an impractical and improvident theosophist makes small impress upon the thrifty, hard-working business man. The latter may not have knowledge of Karma and Reincarnation, but he has learned the meaning of industry and conservation. He knows, we say, "the value of money." These elementary forms of common sense cannot be sneered at by those who would convert the world to the "sanctified" common sense called Theosophy. To be "above" worldly matters is not to glory in an inefficient slackness in discharging material responsibilties. Yoga is skill in the performance of action, and there is a skill appropriate to every plane.

The importance of being "practical" as well as of talking of "high ideals" is underlined by recent developments in the field of social reform. For some years now, young men of altruistic bent, drawn by the pattern of the race mind to train for the clergy, have been laying aside the cloth and adopting more direct lines of action. "Too many people are *talking* about doing good from the pulpit," one of them was lately heard to observe. "I am going to *do* some good." Such men are going into welfare work, they are joining the Cooperative Movement and becoming active in the Socialist Party. A typical expression of this tendency was the Malvern Conference in Scotland, of January, 1941, when a group of leading English ecclesiastics ranged themselves behind a program with clear socialist implications.

Such efforts to be practical reflect two emergent attitudes of the race mind, both of which need to be recognized by the theosophist. First, there is a growing distrust and even contempt for high-sounding phrases and empty professions. In the scientific world, this development is reflected in the current demand for "operational" definitions. "Don't tell me what it is, tell me what it *does,*" urges the experimentalist, who has come to regard all abstract statements as meaningless. This requirement is a constructive aspect of agnosticism in science, for the reason that it eschews materialistic abstractions as well as the theological. It is really the beginning of a new scientific attitude that is completely sophisticated toward *any* sort of "assumption." As operationalism grows popular, the need for philosophy will become evident, and operationalists will not be able to take refuge in the abstractions of materialism.

Not only are scientists demanding more practical definition of their fundamental concepts, but also, they are calling for greater social responsibility among the members of their profession. This is true of all branches of scientific inquiry. Astronomers as well as psychologists, geologists no less than sociologists, are anxious to

understand *human* problems and to put their knowledge to work more effectively for the good of mankind. Within the past five years, working scientists have filled the pages of their periodical literature with challenges to each other to face and deal with the great social problems of the age. This attitude is summed up in the excellent book by Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge for What?* Thus the yearning to be practical runs all through our society, and the wish of the clergy to be doers of good works instead of repeaters of lofty sentiments is simply one phase of a broad tendency that is manifesting at every level of human activity.

The other emergent attitude to be noted is what is commonly called "anti-intellectualism," which finds expression in the great mass movements of emotionalism that have precipitated the present world war. The works of the mind are increasingly condemned because intellectuality has so long been divorced from ethical ideas and practical humanitarianism that all abstract thought is believed to be socially sterile. The Theosophical teaching that the reconstruction of society can follow only upon the spread of actual self-knowledge is at the present time an unpopular social heresy. In fact, some writers go so far as to single out the expression, "Self-knowledge," and to ridicule it as the theme of escapist schools of thought. The same general criticism of the Theosophical demand for disciplined thinking, for the study of philosophy, is maintained by the scientist, the socialist, and the liberal clergyman. Ideas, these groups hold, are relatively unimportant. Action is what counts. Now we have to *do something.*

How shall this criticism be met? Many years ago, H. P. Blavatsky provided the answer in "Let Every Man Prove His Own Work." This article, recently reprinted in THEOSOPHY, deals with every phase of the so-called "practical" criticisms of the Theosophical Movement. In her discussion of the problem, however, H. P. B. goes much further than a mere rejoinder to critics. This article is above all a charge to theosophists themselves to fulfill the practical aspect of the responsibilities they have undertaken. How, indeed, is the world ever to see that Theosophical ideas are "practical" in a larger sense than physical philanthropy, unless it becomes evident that Theosophy has the power to transform the lives of individual theosophists?

No greater happiness can come to a student of Theosophy than the feeling evoked by the question, "What are the ideas that make you live the kind of life that you do?" Of course, the question is seldom put so directly, and more often the student has only a hint

or two dropped unconsciously, that his attempt to live the life has induced in others a desire to know his doctrine. The very humility of the student in not thinking much of the example he may be setting is a powerful disarmer of the critical or sceptical spirit in others. It is not "humility" in the Christian sense of self-abasement, which is usually a specious means of calling attention to one's virtue, but rather the impersonality of the theosophist that wins a hearing for Theosophical ideas. The type of promulgation which lays particular stress on the "virtue" of the one who speaks always suggests personal comparisons, bearing the overtones of self-righteousness and moral condemnation. This method of persuasion theosophists leave to the priests, who usually know no better.

Even the imperfections that are felt by every Theosophical student can become the means of mastering some of the mysteries of human nature. There are occasions when, in his enthusiasm to win an adherent for Theosophy, one may "hold forth" in an impressive manner, hoping to awe his prospect into forgetting his objections. Fortunate is the student who finds himself "feeling silly" in the midst of such a performance. What business has he with any such "blind belief" technique? The true object of Theosophical discourse is to meet all objections on the Manasic level, to satisfy the critical sense of the inquirer, whenever possible, according to its own terms, not to dazzle it with a display of intellectual fireworks. Then, too, there is no harm in admitting one's ignorance where in fact ignorance exists. The claim that Theosophy has an answer to every question is not made for students, but for the philosophy. Attempts to give facile explanation to everything that is asked, whether or not the application of the teaching is clear, *ought* to inspire distrust on the part of the sensible inquirer. The questioner who swallows every statement that is made, with trusting nods and easy acquiescence, will not learn to spread the teaching further. The desideratum of Theosophic education is not a series of pious "yesses." Actually, an inquirer who has no serious problems to work out in his own mind before he accepts Theosophy is very likely to be only a luke-warm Theosophist after he does.

Practical Theosophy means Theosophy applied all the time, not simply to specified situations that have come to be recognized as calling for the use of Theosophical knowledge. Practical Theosophy is the spirit in which things are done, an attitude assumed and maintained, through the humdrum hours and tasks as well as the altitude of high achievement. When practicing Theosophy becomes limited to special phases of life, then it has fallen to the level of a religion,

and is philosophy no longer. For that, after all, is the habit of those who place their faith in the acquirement of virtues. Compared with living the Higher Life, "practicing the virtues" is a sinecure. Virtuous acts have external definition; they mark the path of the manifested; the virtuous man is always doing something "special," and inwardly he contrasts his own purity and merit with those sinful ones who are not so "good" as he. The Theosophist, however, knows that the greatest virtue he can acquire is the absence of all idea of virtues as "personal" accomplishments, because personal virtue raises a barrier between himself and suffering, sinning mankind. The practical lover of his fellows is so intent upon serving them that he forgets himself entirely. That is how saviors are born.

THE REAL AND THE UNREAL

Shams and delusions are esteemed for soundest truths, while reality is fabulous. If men would steadily observe realities only, and not allow themselves to be deluded, life, to compare it with such things as we know, would be like a fairy tale and the Arabian Nights' Entertainments. If we respected only what is inevitable and has a right to be, music and poetry would resound along the streets. When we are unhurried and wise, we perceive that only great and worthy things have any permanent and absolute existence,—that petty fears and petty pleasures are but the shadow of the reality. This is always exhilarating and sublime. . . . I have read in a Hindoo book that "There was a king's son, who, being expelled in infancy from his native city, was brought up by a forester, and, growing up to maturity in that state, imagined himself to belong to the barbarous race with which he lived. One of his father's ministers having discovered him, revealed to him what he was, and the misconception of his character was removed, and he knew himself to be a prince. So soul," continues the Hindoo philosopher, "from the circumstances in which it is placed, mistakes its own character, until the truth is revealed to it by some holy teacher, and then it knows itself to be *Brahme*." I perceive that we inhabitants of New England live this mean life that we do because our vision does not penetrate the surface of things. We think that *is* which *appears* to be.

—HENRY DAVID THOREAU.

MAN'S HIGHEST POWER

And that power which the disciple shall covet is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men.—*Light On the Path.*

FEW men place real value upon the plain and simple things of life. For most, it is the vain, the noisy and spectacular that hold first rank. Even philosophers find it difficult to look beyond the maze of the unreal to that which is real, permanent, worth-while. We constantly aim and aspire to the phenomenal gifts of life; we are swept away by the glamor of the spectacular; we judge our fellows in terms of what they possess of these. Yet, ever before us, within us, is the highest prize that nature holds, unseen because of its nearness, not valued because of its simplicity.

Have we observed the limitless wealth of Nature, the variety of her gifts possible of attainment by man? Have we appraised these gifts so as to assure ourselves of their true worth? For we must know that Nature is generous—she withholds not her hand. The demand is made, the supply inevitably flows—matters not the nature of the demand. All her gifts have value; not one but has its rightful use. But some are of permanent worth, while others last but for a season. Mistaking comes from placing permanent values upon impermanent things, from confusing the unreal with the real.

Can we blame Nature, then, for taking from us what we know must die, for allowing to decay before our eyes the treasures we hold most dear? Is Life at fault because *we* become attached to dying things, because of *our* unwisdom in choosing that upon which our hearts are set? Nature appoints no wards to guide us in our choosing; she questions not the wisdom of the choice. Following faithfully the blueprint of desire, she brings to each the object of his want. Man is the responsible agent. His is the necessity to choose aright, to learn to distinguish between the true and the false, to center his thoughts upon worthy ideals.

What, then, is the highest gift toward which a man may aspire? What is that possession—simple, practical, undying—most worthy of his endeavor? What is that power so valued and desired by sages and wise men of all times?

It is discrimination, judgment, right wisdom.

Good judgment, states H. P. Blavatsky, is the highest power that any man can possess, a gift so rare that Nature has naught in all her kingdoms to compare. It is not a gift in the sense that we use the term, but that which enables us to evaluate *all* gifts. It is not a

power or possession, but that by which we direct and use our powers and possessions. Greater than wealth, power or knowledge, it is of another nature than the worldly. Some say it is the vision of the Soul, a light from within by which all things become clear and understandable. It manifests in life as correct cognition or clear-seeing—the ability to do the right thing, at the right time, and in the right place. No outward signs of greatness mark the man who is its owner. Yet, without it, nothing that we have or do is safe in our hands. Without good judgment, even wealth may be the cause of our spiritual downfall, power used to injure and destroy, knowledge turned into a tool for personal gain.

But how is this power acquired? Can it be gained by all, or is it a blessing held only by the few, a sort of privilege bestowed upon man by some jealous God?

"Correct cognition," says Patanjali, "results from perception, inference, and testimony." That is to say, the means by which right judgment is acquired is threefold in its nature and operation. It results from the intuition of the *soul,* the reasoning of the *mind,* and the testimony of the *senses.* These three are a triple-lensed telescope through which the Perceiver looks. Just as the astronomer gazes through his instrument into the depths of heaven, so peers man into his own world of experience. But would we not vote the astronomer a fool who looked through the wrong end of his telescope, hoping thereby to note the movements of the stars? All he could see would be a distorted image of himself reflected upon the surface of the lens. So in the case of man. It is only by *beginning* with the soul, by listening *first* to the voice of intuition, that clear seeing can be had. Only then can mind, bathed in the light of soul, reason from an impersonal basis; only then can the testimony of the senses be trusted, understood, used.

Intuition is not some strange and miraculous power, foreign to the needs of daily life. It is real, practical, necessary—an indispensable factor to all right action. The summation of past days, years, and lives of experience, it is the bringing to bear of *what we know* upon present act and decisions. Yet, how seldom is it used; how few even are aware of its presence in them!

There is not a man but in whom lies the possibility of good judgment; not one but has the power to see aright. Only, like the foolish star gazer, most of us look through the wrong end of our telescopes. We begin with the senses, judge by appearances, and make our calculations on the basis of what we see, hear or feel. The senses are important—they are our means of contact with physical life. But

mere physical contact does not complete an experience. What we see or hear must be weighed against the knowledge of the soul, must be analyzed and checked by the reasoning of an unbiased mind. The outlook of the senses is particular, narrow, and limited to one small point in space and time. The outlook of the Soul is universal, embracing at a glance all past and future considerations.

Discrimination, therefore, is not possible to the man who judges by appearances, who neglects the soul in the wider range of its operation. Discrimination is a soul-power, and soul-powers can be exercised only from soul qualities. Kindness, trust, and interest in the good of others, are all qualities natural to the human soul, powers latent in every human heart. It is from this basis that right judgment must proceed.

But we do not take this position because we are afraid that others will not do the same. We live in fear for the well-being of our personal selves. We labor under belief that it is only fools who trust, and that the height of all unwisdom is to be betrayed in an act of kindness. But is this really true?

Consider the example of H. P. Blavatsky in her dealings with all whom she came to help. She was accused by her worldly-wise friends of great unwisdom, of making terrible mistakes when some whom she trusted turned into bitter enemies. "How is it possible," they would say, "that with all her knowledge and power, she could not tell her friends from her enemies, was unable to know whom to trust and whom not to trust. What awful mistakes she made." Did she? Whose was the mistake, that of the one who trusted or of the one who betrayed the trust? H. P. B. trusted all, because she knew that in every human heart is a spark of good, that only through that could any man be helped, that only thus could she herself embody the Adept rule of Universal Brotherhood. To have been betrayed does not mean that she made mistakes, or failed to see in her pupils a possible leaning towards the evil path. H. P. B. saw all, good tendencies and bad alike, but appealed ever to the good. Many, unquestionably, were her disappointments when some whom she trusted failed to live up to their highest possibilities; but think of the numbers "lighted-up" and inspired to a better life because of her trust in them.

To act, therefore, with trust and discrimination does not mean that one will never be betrayed or disappointed, that his personal self will bask forever in the sunlight of worldly ease. Past Karma must be met. Present betrayal received at the hands of others is only an *effect,* a reaping of the results of past acts of doubt and

suspicion on our own part. But to trust *now,* whatever the effects, to affirm one's faith in the heart of man, is true wisdom, a rising from effects to the plane of *causes.* Whereas doubt creates separateness and is based upon the law of retaliation, trust creates love by arousing the best and highest there is in the human heart. Trust builds for the future by strengthening the bond of Universal Brotherhood. It is better that one trust and be a thousand times betrayed than once to distrust an honest friend.

Man colors his vision, beclouds his discrimination, by the attitude he takes toward others. If he be doubtful, untrusting of his friends, everything that they do will seem suspicious. If he have faith and trust, no outer acts of sense can ever deceive. How strange it is that one little flash of suspicion will lead a man to doubt the motives of his dearest friends, to question the intentions of those who, if he would but listen to the voice of a whole life's experience, are working only for his good! How strange it is that man is led to form conclusions on the basis of one single act or impression, while ever within him, ready at his call, is the whole fruition of past learning! Trust opens the mind to wider views, to intuitive perceptions from the soul within. Trust bridges all gaps created by the limitations of sense testimony.

Is the price too high, do we think, for the simple ability to judge aright? Are the demands of the philosophy too great for a power that makes its owner appear as nothing in the eyes of men? Is it too much to ask of him who would have it that he practice trust in the face of all distrust, that he render good for evil, and live as Soul, while all those around him are working for their own good—that he be the first to turn the tide of selfishness so that all humanity may eventually be led to the better way?

The demand is great but the reward is greater. What joy can compare with the peace and contentment that comes to the heart filled with trust in one's fellow man? What words will describe, what blessings equal, the satisfaction of Soul-Wisdom—the ability to see, know, and *understand* the meaning of all that goes on around us? For Soul-Wisdom *is* understanding, or right judgment—Man's highest power. Simple, eternal, inherent in the soul itself, good judgment lights the way at every step in one's journey on the Path of Life.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Christian Humanism"

Specious reasoning combined with self-evident facts, coated with a well-mannered benevolence, and served up by one who writes with a modestly "knowing" air, make a deceptive and therefore peculiarly deadly compound. This is the form of Christian persuasion offered by *Fortune* for April, 1942, in "Christian Humanism," an article by Jacques Maritain, "Europe's foremost Catholic philosopher." Before examining what this eminent Thomist, now at the University of Chicago, has to say, it should be recalled that in January, 1940, *Fortune* devoted an editorial to reprimanding orthodox Christianity in America. The churches were accused of compromising with Mammon, and the clergy, who should have been maintaining absolute moral standards, were found to be simply reflecting passing currents of public opinion. The flock, *Fortune* declared, "is leading the shepherd." Speaking "in all humility" for the laity, the editors urged modern Christian leaders to renounce their "materialism," lest civilization recede—"so long as the Church pretends, or assumes to preach, absolute values, but actually preaches relative and secondary values, it will merely hasten this process of disintegration." (See Theosophy XXVIII, 239.)

Proprietors of Culture

Several commentators noted *Fortune's* curious departure from its chosen task of glorifying Big Business to read a lecture to the Christian Church. The explanation, possibly, lies in the fact that for some time now, captains of industry have fondly regarded themselves as the true guardians of civilization. The loyalty of the National Association of Manufacturers to our Glorious Traditions is equalled only by its resolve that patriotism shall never interfere with profits. So that, as spokesman for commerce and industry, Mr. Henry Luce, *Fortune* publisher, having already delivered himself of the charter for American economic imperialism ("The American Century," *Life,* Feb. 17, 1941), now quite logically provides a hearing for the *Weltanschauung* of modern Catholicism, as defined by the scholarly and personally ingratiating Jacques Maritain.

It should always be remembered, when reading so plausible a writer as M. Maritain, that he speaks as a servant of the Mother

Church, and is not the first of her siren voices. In this article, he is concerned with the "secularization" of the West, describing it as

> the progressive loss, in modern ideology, of all the certitudes, coming either from metaphysical insight or from religious faith, which had given foundation and granted reality to the image of Man in the Christian system . . . philosophic Reason . . . was obliged to decline toward a positivist denial. . . . Human Reason lost its grasp on Being, and became available only for the mathematical reading of sensory phenomena, and for the building up of corresponding material techniques—a field in which any absolute reality, any absolute truth, and any absolute value is of course forbidden.

"A Paste Without Leaven"

Allowing for Christian bias, this analysis may be admitted, as also the following passage, which suggests a schizophrenic division between Christian profession and practice—the theme of the *Fortune* editorial. The split, M. Maritain says, has

> progressively increased between the real behavior of this secularized Christian world and the moral and spiritual principles which had given it its meaning and its internal consistency, and which it came to ignore. Thus this world seemed emptied of its own principles; it tended to become a universe of words, a nominalistic universe, a paste without leaven. It lived and endured by habit and by force acquired from the past, not by its own power; it was pushed forward by a *vis a tergo,* not by an internal dynamism. It was utilitarian, its supreme rule was utility. Yet utility which is not a means toward a goal is of no use at all.

Love Alone!

So long as the "turning away from God" side of the Catholic diagnosis is omitted, such criticisms are very much to the point. But like Protestant theologians, M. Maritain believes "love" to be all that is needed to "inspire" the new society:

> The general paganization of our civilization has resulted in man's placing his hope in force alone and in the efficacy of hate, whereas in the eyes of an integral humanism a political ideal of justice and civic friendship, requiring political strength and technical equipment, but inspired by love, is alone able to direct the work of social regeneration.
>
> The image of man involved in integral humanism is that of a being made of matter and spirit, whose body may have emerged from the historical evolution of animal forms, but whose immortal soul directly proceeds from divine creation.

How skillfully M. Maritain blesses modern biology with a friendly acknowledgment while engaged in the more important business of repeating good Thomist doctrine on the creation of the human soul by God! This conception is the heart of scholastic philosophy, the one idea that Catholics will never relinquish or even subordinate: God *must* be a personal creator.

Judicious Compromises

Neo-Thomism, a revival of medieval scholasticism, dates from the encyclical of Leo XIII in 1879, in which Catholics were ordered to "restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas and propagate it far and wide." A modern version of Thomism has resulted, permitting all sorts of subtleties and judicious compromises with modern science so long as God remains as first cause and artificer of the world. Today, as of old, the scholastics wage relentless war on all pantheistic tendencies. Man, while he may be the *image* of God, cannot be part of the divine substance; his essence is separate and distinct. This is the basic theological deception; without it there would be no Church, nor need of priests to intercede with God for the soul's salvation.

An Almost Brotherly City

Having reinstated God, Maritain presents the enticing prospect of a community of religion, races and nations, coupled with a vision of "bread and wine" for all, to say nothing of a Divine Dressing of Wounds. In this new age, "a Christian philosophy of life would guide a vitally, not decoratively, Christian community." . . . What the world needs "is a new humanism, a 'theocentric' or integral humanism, which would consider man in all his natural grandeur and weakness, in the entirety of his wounded being inhabited by God." And now for the "fundamentals" on which to base the new "god-centered" order—the transcendent reasoning that will satisfy the wide-awake man of today, fresh from a cold shower of scientific "facts." What are the signs by which he shall know that this is more than "wishful thinking"?

> The supreme ideal which the political and social work in mankind has to aim at is thus the inauguration of a brotherly city, which does not imply the hope that all men will some day be perfect on earth and love each other fraternally, but the hope that the existential *state* of human life and the structures of civilization will draw nearer to their perfection, the standard of which is justice and friendship—and what aim, if not perfection, is to be aimed at?

THEOLOGICAL "FEET OF CLAY"

The dream, no longer mere sweet delusion, is become hopelessly confused, let alone unphilosophical. M. Maritain would have us aim at perfection, yet not expect to hit the mark. He would establish an ideal community where men should strive to love their fellows with all their heart, yet he denies their capacity to do so. And, because of man's essential imperfection—heritage of "original sinning," no doubt—the Catholic "democracy" of tomorrow will require "not only the development of powerful technical equipment and of a firm and rational politico-social organization in human communities, but also a heroic philosophy of life, and the quickening inner ferment of evangelical inspiration." But, "in order to advance toward such an ideal . . . the community must be strong." Will a reincarnated Dominican Order provide this "discipline," after the style of the "protectors of the Faith" in the thirteenth century—with the rack and faggot? We may paraphrase the Bible, and ask, Where is the "heroic philosophy of life" to be found, and where is the place of "inspiration"?

In building up his "almost" idealism, M. Maritain is hampered at the outset by shaky fundamentals, for he can never consider man as anything more than a creature of God, a thing of "grandeur and weakness." He is thus constantly mocked by an unsolved, and, incidentally, unsolvable, problem—the connection between man's spirit and God's spirit. So long as the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God are kept distinct and different, men will choose the path that holds out most promise for them personally, and, as the last 2,000 years have testified, that path will not be brotherhood.

TOWARD SACERDOTALISM

The honeyed persuasion of "Europe's foremost Catholic philosopher" is part of a continuous effort of the Church to "adopt" modern science. This attempt may be traced through Neo-Thomism, whose adherents today include Etienne Gilson, Maurice De Wulf, and Mortimer Adler. (See THEOSOPHY, XXVII, 546fn.) "Feelers," such as Rev. John S. O'Conor's "Scientific Approach to Religion" (*Scientific Monthly,* October, 1940; see also the scientific reply in the February, 1941, issue) are not to be considered as isolated instances, but as part of a deliberate conditioning toward a new dictatorship of dogma to masquerade, perhaps, under the slogan, "scientific religion," or "religious science." Those who see through such pretense have the responsibility of exposing it to all who will listen.

Brains Old and New

Among the numerous symptoms of unconscious black magic in medicine is the growing interest in "psychosurgery." Recent experiments in this field have dealt with little-known parts of the human brain and their effect on the behavior and emotional reactions of the patient. Past and present brain surgery presents the conclusion that the prefrontal lobes, or "new" brain, are used in thinking and planning—capacities differentiating humans from animals. The "old" brain, attributed to animal heritage,

> is the seat of emotion—of hates, fears, desires, love, appetite. It is connected with the prefrontal lobes by thick nerve cables. There is a perpetual struggle between the prefrontal lobes, the thinking new brain, and the thalamus, the emotional older brain. All our thinking is colored by some emotion in consequence.

The idea of a "perpetual struggle" in the brain is a materialized version of occult physiology. In *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 301), H. P. Blavatsky suggests that the development of the cerebral hemispheres may be an index to intellectual and spiritual development; both the cerebellum, seat of the animal proclivities, she implies, and the cerebrum, connected with the intellectual powers, should be dominated by the spiritual organ in the brain. However, she concludes, "It must be remembered that these are *only physical correspondences;* just as the ordinary human brain is the registering organ of memory, but not memory itself."

Breaking Pathways

The "psycho-surgeons" maintain:

> In a normal person the prefrontal lobes are able to dominate the thalamus, so that our hate, fear, worry and desire to steal and kill can be controlled. There is reason to believe that in the mentally afflicted the prefrontal lobes are no longer able to perform their controlling duty. Hence the bursts of temper, the yielding to anxiety, the inability to face the world as it is.

The theory of psycho-surgery is that "fixed pathways have been established between the prefrontal lobes and the thalamus," and that if these pathways are broken, and new ones established, recovery might result. Here, in general, is the basis of the currently popular "shock" treatments for insanity, where drastic treatments are given in hopes of destroying undesirable brain patterns, or thought habits. There is positive indication that this is simply "snipping off the tops

of the weeds." The thoughts of the Thinker establish channels in his instrument, the brain. These channels may be artificially destroyed or disturbed, but unless they are restored to constructive patterns by the *will* of the patient—re-formed, that is, by a new line of "meditation"—how can there be a *cure?*

EMBARRASSING EXCESSES

The *Times* summarizes the work of Egas Moniz, Portuguese neurologist, in brain surgery:

> The results of the operation were astonishing in a good percentage of cases. Melancholics became cheerful. Worry, fear, hate disappeared. The world which had seemed so dark became a delightful place. Indeed, the good humor was sometimes embarrassingly excessive.

In a similar case a few years ago, in which a Chicago broker had some of his "thinking centers" removed, the neurologist reported that for two years thereafter, mental tests

> showed that the man had greater persistence, greater optimism and self-confidence and a lack of tendency to worry. On the other hand . . . the post-operative tests showed also a deterioration of the intellectual functions, particularly in the faculty of discrimination. (New York *Times,* June 12, 1937.)

These effects, excessive animal exuberance and a deterioration of the highest faculties of the mind, are evidence that, in some cases at least, brain surgery breaks the connection between the higher Ego and the brain, or personal mind. This makes of the victim of such operations virtually an embodied *Kama Rupa,* whose psychic characteristics, as described in medical literature, correspond to those of the Kamalokic shell. The latter, H. P. B. says in *Transactions,* when the higher triad enters Devachan, "re-becomes that which it was from the beginning, a principle endued with purely animal instincts, made happier still by the great change."

BRAINLESS THINKING

To Waldemar Kaempffert's comment, "Whether we are materialists or not, the fact remains that without brains we cannot think," we attach a report from the clinic of Dr. Nicolas Ortiz, prominent Bolivian physician (see *Coronet,* September, 1940):

> The patient, a boy of 14 years, was actively thinking up to the time of his death. He only complained of a violent headache. The autopsy, however, revealed that the brain mass was almost entirely detached from the bulb, *a condition which amounted to real decapitation.* There was a large abscess involving all of the cerebellum, and part of the cerebrum. *What did he think with?*

Science Is Two-faced

The longer scientists continue their discoveries, the more apparent it becomes that there are striking differences among investigators as to the rightful place and function of science. Two scientists, writing in the *Scientific Monthly* about a year apart (April, 1940 and July, 1941), present views remarkable as polar opposites, if not as contributions to knowledge. The first spokesman, Leslie A. White, represents the science which regards itself as Authority on everything from matter to mind; which takes to itself the credit for all so-called "scientific advances" to date, and confidently expects that all problems will in the progress of time be resolved by natural extension of scientific method. Says Dr. White:

> . . . all scientific progress in biology and psychology has been made on the basis of the materialistic, mechanistic assumption that "life" and "mind" are merely properties of matter-organized-in-cellular-form, just as iron or "iron-ness" is a property of one kind of organization of protons, electrons, etc., while "goldness" is the property of another kind of organization of the same sort of particles. How "matter"—carbon, iron, calcium, etc.—can come to have cellular form and manifest those properties which we call "life" and "mind" is, however, a real problem—to the solution of which "linguistic legerdermain" can not, of course, contribute anything. But neither can the philosopher. This is a task for the scientist—the physicist, the biochemist, the biologist. (*Scientific Monthly,* April, 1940.)

Science With Ideals

On the other hand, Dr. F. Cyril James, writing on the powers and functions of science, has a becoming modesty—the sign of a mind with vision. Dr. James's view has promise for those who hope for universal acceptance of a scientific philosophy:

> . . . we do not wish to solve our problems by crystallizing society on a low level of material well-being. Today we recognize more clearly than ever before that our ideals are more precious than our goods and, by the very recognition of that important fact, we perceive the dichotomy of our problem. Each aspect of it demands separate consideration. (*Scientific Monthly,* July, 1941.)

Where social ideals are concerned, the scientific method must be guided by ethical purpose:

> In the first place, we must define clearly the philosophy of our society. What are the ideals that it cherishes? By what standards will it judge its members? This is not a scientific problem, and it is not capable of solution by scientific methods. It concerns economics

no more than it concerns physics, since science merely shows what will happen if we do a certain thing and remains silent as to the wisdom of the act.

"SCIENTISTS ARE HUMAN"

The urgency of the problem demands that prejudice, whether personal or professional, be discarded:

> But this problem is of direct significance to every one of us as members of western society, since the life of our society depends upon the fact that we do share common ideals and that these ideals are strong enough to hold society together during both prosperity and adversity. Moreover, we must bring to our study of this problem (even though it be labeled religion or philosophy) the same love of truth and the same desire to investigate that characterize our work in the narrower scientific fields. All too often, we have seen the scientist become a man of prejudice as soon as he leaves the laboratory, so that his attitude before the ballot box shows none of the patience and judgment that appear in his professional writings.

Social idealism must have a rational basis:

> It should also be emphasized that our decision on this problem of social philosophy must be as specific as the decision on any scientific question. All of us, in this hour of our nation's crisis, believe so fervently in the ideals of democracy and liberty that we are willing to sacrifice ourselves and all our goods for their defense. But have we clearly defined those ideals? What is our attitude toward the conflict between national sovereignty and an organized world? How do we define "the ideals of democracy" in regard to such things as freedom of trade, social insurance and migrations of people? How can we ensure the welfare of society and yet preserve the freedom of the individual? At the present moment there is no clear answer to these questions from western society as a whole, yet this broad problem of social philosophy must be solved before we can expect that the impact of science will become wholly beneficial.

This is the kind of science that the world has need of—a science that shoulders its ethical responsibility.

EMOTIONAL IMMATURITY

Alcohol, used as a beverage, acts on the psychic plane to stimulate the Kamic tendencies. As described by Dr. Frank Garm Norbury in the *Journal* of the American Medical Association (Jan. 3, 1942):

> It is believed that in the present stage of knowledge about overindulgence in alcohol the most important question is "Why?" Why are these people [alcoholics] superficial? Why, when they "get a

thirst" do family, business, social responsibilities sit lightly? Why do entreaties of relatives, partners, friends do no good? The answer to these questions is well known to physicians. It embraces the desire to conform, ambition to be able to drink socially, to be a man among men. All these are adolescent types of reaction indicative of emotional immaturity. They fit in with characteristics presented [by a group of alcoholic patients—professional and business people]. So far as capacity, general activity and effect are concerned, most of these patients appear to fall into a cyclothymic [excessively moody] category with associated mental mechanisms. Overdependence, feelings of inferiority and superficiality are more consistent with the schizoid ["split personality"] tendency, with the last of these traits being predominant. The material offered here agrees with the opinion of many that the reason for alcoholism is to be found in the personality of the individual.

As Dr. Norbury remarks, "the disturbance is emotional," and, in view of the relation between *Manas* and *Kama,* there is essential medical wisdom in his emphasis on the importance of *mental* treatment, or psychotherapy. He believes that "recognition on the part of the intelligent patient and a constructive attitude of personal responsibility developed through direct psychotherapeutic approach has had something to do with the success." Some day doctors may realize that the will of the patient has *everything* to do with recovery from alcoholism.

Law of Dissolution

Alcoholism may be considered a form of insanity, and as such constitutes a breakage between the Ego and his instrument, the mind and the brain. The process is well put by Joshua Rosett in *The Mechanism of Thought, Imagery, and Hallucination* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1939):

The highest functions are most affected [by alcohol]. The person who has taken the alcohol talks more fluently and brilliantly, his wits are sharpened, he has a feeling of strength. If the dose has been too large, the stage of exaltation of these or any other functions quickly passes into one of depression, the highest functions being affected first, and the stimulation and depression of function proceed regularly from the highest to the lowest. The action of alcohol thus illustrates the "law of dissolution," which states that functions which have appeared latest in the animal series or the individual are the most easy to influence, those which have appeared earlier are less easy to influence; and so by regular sequence till we arrive at those functions which are first developed, which are the last to be influ-

> enced. . . . The power of judgment is abolished very early by alcohol; this is so while the imagination, the emotions, and the power of speech still remain stimulated; but soon the power of imagination goes, the patient loses all command over his emotions, he cries and laughs irregularly, but this soon stops. He next begins to lose control over his speech, talking incoherently and thickly; shortly afterwards he cannot talk at all, but can only make a noise. Muscular movements, which are not so highly developed as those of speech, are next affected. . . .

Confronted with the *total* effect of alcohol, it is natural that any single branch of the scientific "tree" should find itself inadequate to resolve the "problem." Anton Julius Carlson, called "the dean of U. S. physiologists," recently told a meeting of the Research Council on Problems of Alcohol that alcoholism

> is too complex for any one of our biological and medical disciplines. The sociologist should be present at the start, and I imagine we will not travel very far before we ask for the aid of the geneticist and the educator. . . . [It] is going to be a labor of Hercules (*Time,* Jan. 6, 1941).

IT'S NOT FUNNY

The same meeting was addressed by a psychiatrist, Bernard Glueck, who maintained that "drunkenness is a problem because the public thinks it's funny." (*Time.*) Strange sense of humor, that sees "humor" in the wreckage of wholesome and normal life! When every year brings to public attention additional reasons, *scientific* ones, for not poisoning ourselves, the plea of ignorance is no longer valid. From his knowledge of the law of cycles, the theosophist reiterates that alcoholism is but one ripple of the rising psychic "wave" of self-indulgence.

PENT-UP "PATRIOTISM"

Eight thousand school children in New Brunswick, N. J., recently gave way for more than an hour to an outburst of hysteria, in what "educators seem to believe" might be "a manifestation of pent-up patriotic fervor." (N. Y. *Times,* April 22, 1942.) The occasion was a war bond rally, at the end of which the children were to march in review before a motion picture actress. Instead of continuing to a point a few blocks away, as planned, the lines broke at the reviewing stand and 8,000 high school and elementary school students began screaming the name of the screen star. All pleas for a restoration of order were ignored.

> Helpless adults, agape at the extraordinary spectacle of children gone completely beyond their control—and this included the police reserves—finally gave way before the screaming and shouting youngsters and abandoned the program.

A parallel case occurred the week previous in Newark, N. J., where 1,700 high school pupils

> shouted themselves hoarse at sight of the Newark Bears baseball team and drowned out the serious parts of the program. . . . In Newark the children responded to the national anthem and cheered mention of General MacArthur for five minutes. They got completely out of hand, however, over the playing of a hot "name" band.

Judging from the report, the extraordinary feature of these displays was their wholly irrational character. "There was no intelligible theme," runs the account. "The children seemed vague as to what inspired their hullabaloo." Hysteriacs and the insane usually are.

Drops Presage the Monsoon

As emotional excesses of this order increase, the theosophist feels more and more the need for equilibrium between the psychic and the manasic potentialities of the race. Reflecting on the defenselessness of these crowds of children, whose susceptible psychic natures make them easy victims to waves of emotion, "patriotic" or otherwise, we may recall that about a century ago, when the phenomena of Spiritualism broke out in America, it was among *children* that obsessions first took place. The mediumship of the Fox sisters was preceded by extensive manifestations eleven years earlier, among the children of various Shaker communities in New York. Today, with the whole world engulfed by the madness of war, these currents of psychic force are being renewed. A day of reckoning will come for the generation who so prepared seeds of mass insanity for the little children now growing up among us.

A Welcomed "Conquest"

The Chinese ambassador to the United States, Hu Shih, has lately acknowledged the great obligation of China to India, Motherland of civilization. Speaking on "India, Our Great Teacher" at the celebration of "India-China Friendship Day," March 14, held in New York City, the scholarly statesman said:

> It is a well-known historical fact that India conquered and dominated China culturally for twenty centuries without ever having to send a single soldier across her borders. This cultural conquest was never imposed by India on her neighbors. It was all the result of voluntary searching, voluntary learning, voluntary pilgrimage and voluntary acceptance on the part of China.
>
> The real explanation was that the great religion of Buddhism satisfied a need keenly felt by the Chinese people of the time. . . . Ancient China had only a simple conception of retribution for good and evil: but India gave us the conception of *Karma,* the idea of absolute causation running through past, present and future existences. . . .

"LIGHT OF ASIA"

> For more than a thousand years, from the first century A. D. down to the eleventh century, Chinese pilgrims continued to travel by land and by sea to India to seek its scriptures in their original texts and to study under the living masters of the faith. Some of these pilgrims spent decades in India and brought back thousands of manuscripts which they devoted their lives to translating and interpreting to their fellow countrymen. Buddhist teachers and missionaries who came to China throughout the ages were always honored and eagerly listened to.

Harking back to an age contemporaneous with the beginning of the Christian era, Hu Shih speaks of an influence that has never had any but a *uniting* effect on human beings. Fittingly, at a time when loud claims of the motive of world peace and "unity" are being made by all the contestants of the present war, the Chinese ambassador recalls a great campaign of the past that "made our Asia mild." How different the method, and how lasting the effect! May be, the unifying genius of Buddhism will one day bring peace to Asia once again.